

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 2, 4-10, 12, 13, 15-21 and 24 are pending in the application. Claim 23 was canceled by a previous amendment. Claims 1, 7, 12 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Callon. Claim 23 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Bialkowski et al. However, because claim 23 was previously canceled, the Applicants presume that this rejection was erroneously copied from the previous Office Action, and is to be ignored. Claims 2, 8, 13 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Callon and in view of Bialkowski. Claims 4, 5, 9, 10, 15, 16, 20 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Callon and in view of Boyd et al. Claims 3, 6, 11, 14, 17 and 22 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but were indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 24 was allowed. Claims 1, 4, 7, 12, 15 and 18 have been amended. Claims 3, 11, 14 and 22 have been canceled.

Prior to the present amendments, claim 3 depended directly from claim 1. The Examiner objected to claim 3 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim (claim 1), but indicated that claim 3 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim (claim 1) and any intervening claims (of which there are none). Rather than amending claim 3, claim 1 has been amended to include all of the limitations of claim 3, and claim 3 has been canceled. Therefore, according to the Examiner, claim 1 is now allowable. In addition, because claims 2 and 4-6 depend from claim 1, those claims are also now allowable.

Prior to the present amendments, claim 11 depended directly from claim 7. The Examiner objected to claim 11 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim (claim 7), but indicated that claim 11 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim (claim 7) and any intervening claims (of which there are none). Rather than amending claim 11, claim 7 has been amended to include all of the limitations of claim 11, and claim 11 has been canceled. Therefore, according to the Examiner, claim 7 is now allowable. In addition, because claims 8 and 9 depend from claim 7, those claims are also now allowable.

Prior to the present amendments, claim 14 depended directly from claim 12. The Examiner objected to claim 14 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim (claim 12), but indicated that claim 14 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim (claim 12) and any intervening claims (of which there are none). Rather than amending claim 14, claim 12 has been amended to include all of the limitations of claim 14, and claim 14 has been canceled. Therefore, according to the Examiner, claim 12 is now allowable. In addition, because claims 13 and 15-17 depend from claim 12, those claims are also now allowable.

Prior to the present amendments, claim 22 depended directly from claim 18. The Examiner objected to claim 22 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim (claim 18), but indicated that claim 22 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim (claim 18) and any intervening claims (of which there are none). Rather than amending claim 22, claim 18 has been amended to include all of the limitations of claim 22, and claim 22 has been canceled. Therefore, according to the Examiner, claim 18 is now allowable. In addition, because claims 19-21 depend from claim 18, those claims are also now allowable.

In view of the amendments described above, all of the Examiner's rejections are now moot, and the Applicants respectfully submit that all of the pending claims, claims 1, 2, 4-10, 12, 13, 15-21 and 24, are in immediate condition for allowance. Applicants have carefully considered all of the points raised in the Office Action and believe that the Examiner's concerns have been addressed as described herein. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

If, for any reason, the Examiner finds that the application is not in condition for allowance, Applicants request that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles telephone number (213) 892-5752 to discuss any steps necessary to place the application in condition for allowance.

In the unlikely event that the transmittal letter is separated from this document and the Patent Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, Applicants petition for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. 03-1952 referencing Docket No. 491442001700.

July 18, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By G. M. Kubota
Glenn M. Kubota
Registration No.: 44,197
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
555 West Fifth Street, Suite 3500
Los Angeles, California 90013
(213) 892-5200